

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 7, 8, 12 and 13 have been rejected, with claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9-11 and 14-16 indicated as containing allowable subject matter, but objected to as a matter of form.

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 have been amended and therefore claims 1, 2 and 4-16 remain in this application.

The Examiner's indication of acceptance of the originally submitted formal drawings is very much appreciated. Additionally, the indicated allowable subject matter in claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9-11 and 14-16 is very much appreciated.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-16 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 (second paragraph) as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner appears to indicate that he is uncertain as to how the active elements "energize electrodes of themselves." Quite clearly, as would be obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art, the active elements simply act as a switch so that electrical power can be applied to the first electrodes as required.

While the above is readily apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art reading the claims, applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 to more clearly recite this obvious interrelationship which is believed to completely overcome any uncertainty as to the operation of the claimed elements. Consideration of these amendments is respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 8, 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Handschy et al (U.S. Patent 6,570,550). While the Examiner correctly notes that Handschy discloses a semiconductor active backplane, the Examiner also admits that

“Handschy does not explicitly discuss that substantially the whole of each active element 46 is covered by at least one, or a pair of the addressing conductors 52, 54.”

The Examiner suggests, however, that in his opinion it would be obvious to provide addressing conductors that cover the active elements of the backplane.

Applicants respectfully disagree with this conclusion. Moreover, the Examiner suggests that such coverage is “very well known in the art” which is definitely not the case.

Should the Examiner have any art or teaching of this element interrelationship, he is respectfully requested to bring this to the applicants’ attention.

The coverage of the active elements of the backplane has the effect of significantly reducing the amount of light that reaches the active elements. This in turn greatly reduces photo-conductivity effects within the active elements and unwanted charge leakage through each active element is reduced. Thus, the backplane structures set out in claims 7 and 8 provide improved electrical isolation and thus improved charge storage when the backplane is illuminated.

The above advantages are described in more detail throughout the present application, i.e. page 5, paragraph 2, page 10, line 18 through page 11, line 7, paragraph 1 of page 15 and lines 3-13 on page 17. One having ordinary skill in the art reading the Handschy reference would not have been motivated to alter the addressing electrodes to cover the active elements.

Moreover, Handschy does not evidence any awareness of the problem of charge leakage associated with photo-conductivity effects, which problem is solved by applicants' addressing electrode coverage.

As a result of the above, there is no basis for rejection of claims 7, 8, 12 and 13 under 35 USC §103 over the Handschy reference and any further rejection thereunder is respectfully traversed.

Having responded to all objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Official Action, it is submitted that remaining claims 1, 2 and 4-16 are in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is respectfully solicited. In the event the Examiner is of the opinion that a brief telephone or personal interview will facilitate allowance of these claims, he is respectfully requested to contact applicants' undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 

Stanley C. Spooner
Reg. No. 27,393

SCS:kmm
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100